

Bradley P. Hartman (#017263)
 John D. Titus (#012912)
HARTMAN TITUS PLC
 7114 E. Stetson Drive, Suite 205
 Scottsdale, AZ 85251-3250
 Phone: (480) 659-0019
 Fax: (480) 659-3304
 Email: bhartman@hartmantitus.com
 jtitus@hartmantitus.com
 Attorneys for Defendant

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

James Oliver Romine Jr.,

No. 2:16-cv-00604-JJT

Plaintiff,

vs.

**DEFENDANT’S RESPONSE IN
 OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
 FOR LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT**

James Nicholas Stanton,

Defendant.

Defendant James Nicholas Stanton responds in opposition to Plaintiff’s *Motion for Leave to File First Amended Complaint* [Doc. 11].

Defendant recognizes that amendments to the complaint “shall be freely given when justice so requires.” *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 78, 182 (1962). However, the district court “may deny leave to amend due to ‘undue delay, bad faith or dilatory motive on the part of the movant, repeated failure to cure deficiencies by amendments previously allowed, undue prejudice to the opposing party by virtue of allowance of the amendment, [and] futility of amendment.’” *Leadsinger, Inc. v. BMG Music Pub.*, 512 F.3d 522, 532 (9th Cir. 2008), quoting *Foman*.

Here, the *Motion for Leave to Amend* should be denied because granting leave to amend is futile given the issues raised in Defendant’s *Motion to Dismiss* [Doc. 12]. Plaintiff does not have standing to sue in his individual capacity for harm suffered by the Arizona limited liability company of which he is a manager and that is the subject of the alleged defamation.

1 The proposed amendments do not change this and are therefore futile. Additionally, Mr.
2 Stanton is not subject to personal jurisdiction in Arizona and the proposed amendments do not
3 change this or add new support for personal jurisdiction in Arizona. Therefore, the
4 amendments are futile. Finally, none of the alleged statements identified in the complaint or
5 the proposed amended complaint can be considered libel under applicable law. Thus, the
6 proposed amendments are futile.

7 Plaintiff does not set forth any proposed amendments that would not be futile for the
8 reasons stated in Defendant's *Motion to Dismiss*. Defendant respectfully requests that the
9 Court grant Defendant's *Motion to Dismiss* and deny Plaintiff's *Motion for Leave to Amend*.

10 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 4th day of May, 2016.

11 **HARTMAN TITUS PLC**

12 By: /s/Bradley P. Hartman

13 Bradley P. Hartman
14 John D. Titus
15 7114 E. Stetson Drive, Suite 205
16 Scottsdale, Arizona 85251-3250
17 Attorneys for Defendant
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 4, 2016, I caused the foregoing document to be filed electronically with the Clerk of Court through CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of Notice to the following CM/ECF registrant:

James Oliver Romine Jr.
12494 Ironwood Dr.
Yuma, AZ 85367
jromine2445@gmail.com
Plaintiff

/s/ Bradley P. Hartman
